

## **Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



# Selected Speeches and News Releases

May 30 - June 5, 1991

## IN THIS ISSUE:

### Remarks—

Prepared for delivery by Secretary of Agriculture, Edward Madigan,  
Seventeenth Session of the World Food Council, Helsingor, Denmark,  
June 5.

### News Releases—

Deadly Disease of Birds Diagnosed in Indiana, Illinois and Michigan

USDA Releases Cost of Food at Home for April

Carver Papers to be Used in Preservation Experiments at USDA

USDA Announces Fees for Classing 1991 Cotton Crop

USDA Announces 1992 Wheat Program Provisions

CCC Interest Rate for June Lowered to 6-1/8 Percent

U.S. Donates Feed Grains to Guatemala

U.S. Donates Commodities to Egypt

States Estimated to Receive \$312 Million in National Forest Payments

USDA Proposes to Adjust Its Requirements for Inspecting Horses at  
Horse Shows

USDA Researcher Follows in the Black Bear's Footsteps—Literally



# Remarks

---

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Public Affairs

---

Prepared for delivery by Secretary of Agriculture, Edward Madigan,  
Seventeenth Session of The World Food Council, Helsingor,  
Denmark, June 5.

President Wally, Executive Director Trant, and fellow members of the  
World Food Council.

I would like to begin by thanking Minister Tornaes for being such a  
fine host and for working so hard to prepare for this meeting.

We have a challenging agenda before us. I would like to address two  
major points—the immediate need to fight world hunger and the potential  
of the Uruguay Round to help developing nations.

I'm sure everyone here has been asked why hunger and malnutrition  
continue to take millions of lives. In the past few months, the starving  
children of Kurdish refugees, Bangladeshi flood victims, Ethiopians, and  
Sudanese have stirred our hearts and consciences.

Clearly, the need is great and a concerted effort by developed and  
developing nations alike is necessary to put an end to such suffering.

Hunger is not the failure of farmers, it is not the failure of scientists—  
it is the failure of political and economic systems to address food needs  
effectively.

Some nations, for example, still do not give agriculture the high  
priority it deserves. Others retain outmoded policies that frustrate  
investment. We in the governments of donor countries could also do  
better. We often go from putting out one fire to the next, spending our  
best energies on emergencies. We need to do a better job of planning,  
and we also need to examine the impact of our national policies on  
developing nations and their people.

In the United States, we are working to better focus our aid on the  
hungry and poor in developing countries.

I am pleased to say that I had a hand in passing legislation that rewrote  
one of America's foremost aid programs—Food for Peace. Over the  
years, Food for Peace has brought over \$44 billion in food aid to every  
quarter of the globe. Major changes in the new law should help  
developing nations significantly.

First, we expect to increase the proportion of U.S. food aid given on a grant basis. Second, the President has new authority to forgive indebtedness. Currently, we can use this authority to ease the burdens of the poorest nations in Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America.

We are also streamlining administration of the Food for Peace programs, and we are continuing efforts such as the Food for Progress program to assist nations moving to free political and economic systems.

I would like to stress that the United States remains strongly committed to supporting food programs through the U.N. system. We were the driving force in founding the World Food Program and have been its single largest donor for nearly 30 years. In this regard, the United States has a candidate to become the next Executive Director of the World Food Program—our Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Food and Consumer Services Catherine Bertini. Her experience and dedication in managing food and nutrition programs for the poor, especially women and children, make her uniquely qualified for this post.

In addition to food assistance, we also need to help bring the right policies, technologies, and training to the farmers of the developing world so they can feed their families. Last year, the United States funded \$1 billion in development aid focused on agriculture. We are funding loans to microenterprises in agriculture, with a strong share going to women. We have a new “Business and Development Partnership Initiative” that actively promotes U.S. private investment in agriculture in the developing world. Promoting agricultural policy reform and private enterprise are the core of our development efforts and form the basis for our new Development Fund for Africa.

We are continuing a long-standing U.S. commitment to research and extension work to help developing countries build their food security. And we have had some major successes. There are scores of ongoing projects. I’ll mention just one. In Kenya, U.S.-sponsored research on hybrid maize has helped double maize production from 1970 to 1988, and new storage technology has cut losses of stored maize in half. With the right tools, technology, and political will, Africa can feed itself. But conquering hunger and poverty in Africa, or the rest of the developing world, is not just a matter of technology; it is not just a matter of aid.

Over the last few decades, the European Community, Japan, and other nations have joined the United States in providing hundreds of billions of dollars of economic aid for the poorer nations of the world. Yet it has not been enough to overcome their hunger and poverty. The simple fact

is that economic aid will never be enough.

Trade is far more effective than aid will ever be in supporting development. A dollar earned in trade generates twice the economic activity of a dollar given as aid.

Trade is at the very heart of economic growth which is the prerequisite to overcoming hunger and malnutrition. Yet the current world trade system strangles the initiative and ability of farmers to trade. And the farmers hurt most by increasing trade distortions, trade restrictions, and protectionism live in the developing world.

The single most important step that can be taken to provide food security for the world is the reform of the world agricultural trading system.

For nearly five years, we have labored in the Uruguay Round to reform trade under the GATT. We have not yet reached our goal. Each year that passes costs consumers and taxpayers in the OECD countries alone close to \$300 billion. And the poorer nations are denied markets and the opportunity to compete fairly in world trade.

Our failure to reach a GATT agreement is costing developing countries tens of billions of dollars in lost exports. The World Bank estimates that developing country losses exceed the roughly \$48 billion they receive in economic aid annually. In agriculture alone, the export losses for developing countries have been estimated to be anywhere from a minimum of \$7 billion up to \$15 billion a year. All told, farmers in developing countries face \$26 billion a year in lost earnings because of current trade policies. By comparison, all the official aid to agriculture in the developing world by donor countries was only a little over \$5 billion in 1986.

Progress in reforming world agricultural policy and trade is essential if developing nations are to have an opportunity to improve their economies through the world market.

Policies which restrict the developing world's access to markets and ability to compete do more than retard economic growth. They also make it difficult to repay international debt and to import. If countries cannot finance imports, their only alternative is to back away from the world market and to strive for self-sufficiency, no matter how inefficient and counter productive such actions may be.

As we work for international agreement on agricultural trade in the GATT, we must focus on an approach which will make trade and economic expansion possible for all nations. Not just for a few.

A freer world trading system has much to offer. Over time, free trade can stimulate competition, increase employment, boost investment, and raise the rate of economic growth. Another benefit especially important for agriculture is that free trade tends to reduce global price instability.

That is why the United States has consistently pushed for agricultural trade liberalization in the GATT negotiations. We need a major change in the world agricultural trading system, and the Uruguay Round is about that change.

It's about change in the direction of agricultural policy, and about change in the rules of the game for agricultural trade which have been sadly lacking.

The agricultural policies used so far have failed—they've failed producers and consumers; they've failed politicians; they've failed world trade; and last, but certainly not least, they've failed to stimulate the market growth that is essential to world agriculture.

These policies typically have involved high support prices or commodity-specific subsidies that have encouraged over-production; restrictive barriers to imports; and export subsidies to dump excess production onto the world market. The trade barriers have affected all producers but have been particularly severe for developing countries, curtailing their economic growth.

Moreover, the export subsidies of the developed world have severely affected agricultural development in the developing world. For the developed world, the result has been programs costing taxpayers and consumers billions of dollars; inflated land values; over-capitalization in agriculture; and over-intensive agriculture which has not encouraged sound environmental practices.

The Uruguay Round is also about opportunity—the opportunity for agriculture to grow and prosper. The basic fact, for developing and developed countries alike, is that the future of agriculture lies in market growth. This requires a trading system that promotes economic growth around the world and provides free and fair access to markets. In the Uruguay Round, we have the opportunity to help spur economic growth and to guide trade policies in the direction of freer trade, rather than toward protectionism and the failed policies of the past.

Trade reform is the path to growth—an essential step toward a productive and efficient global agriculture that rewards producers, supports agricultural and economic development, and provides consumers with increasing supplies of food and fiber at affordable prices.

In the U.S. view, specific disciplines in each of three areas—internal support, market access, and export subsidies—are needed to ensure that reform commitments are clear and transparent and lead in the direction of trade liberalization.

The United States will not settle for less than a solid, comprehensive agreement that changes the direction of support policies, opens markets, and substantially cuts export subsidies. It is only through such measures that a successful conclusion to the Round can be achieved.

Another very important part of a successful agreement will be new disciplines on sanitary and phytosanitary measures. Negotiations on these disciplines have progressed further than the other three areas in agriculture. We need to help rid the trading system of unjustified barriers to trade disguised as measures to protect human, animal, or plant health.

Developing countries must be part of the process of reform and must share in the commitment to reform agricultural trade. Any rules developed in the Uruguay Round must be applied across the board for the full benefits of trade liberalization to be realized.

However, the United States recognizes that there is a need for special and differential treatment for developing nations. We support an agreement that would provide developing nations a longer time frame for implementing many of the measures agreed to in the Uruguay Round, and we recognize the need for more leniency regarding their internal development policies. Criteria will need to be established to determine each developing country's need for special treatment.

The world needs a quality Uruguay Round agreement—not one that merely tinkers at the edges of problems, but one that takes on the issues face-to-face and provides real solutions.

Such reform makes good economic sense, and it also makes good political sense.

I hope that trading nations can come together in the negotiating process to recognize the potential benefits of freer and fairer trade, and to agree on a plan to realize them.

I think that there is understanding worldwide that something needs to be done .... that it is imperative that we make definitive progress on agriculture in the GATT .... and that we make that progress collectively.

President Bush is absolutely committed to freer trade, and I will do all I can to help carry out that commitment. I ask each of you here to join me. In this regard, I am pleased that the Secretariat has drafted a proposed recommendation for consideration by the Council calling for a

“commitment to a successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round negotiations.”

Together, we can reshape world agriculture, and reshape it in such a way that it can provide food security for all nations. The Uruguay Round presents us with an exciting challenge. It is time for us to accept that challenge and to seize its potential.

#

# News Releases

---

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Public Affairs

---

## DEADLY DISEASE OF BIRDS DIAGNOSED IN INDIANA, ILLINOIS AND MICHIGAN

WASHINGTON, May 30—Four outbreaks of exotic Newcastle disease—a deadly viral disease of poultry and pet birds—have prompted the U.S. Department of Agriculture to alert consumers that the pet birds they're buying may be terminally ill with a sickness that could infect other birds, including poultry flocks.

“If this disease enters poultry flocks, losses could climb into millions of dollars,” said James W. Glosser, administrator of USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. “It is important to buy only those imported pet birds that have passed through USDA quarantine.”

The APHIS National Veterinary Services Laboratory in Ames, Iowa, confirmed exotic Newcastle disease after bird owners in Dana, Ind., and Beecher and Champaign, Ill., reported that seven double yellow-headed Amazon parrots they recently purchased became ill and died. The disease was also confirmed in a parrot at a pet shop near Detroit, Mich.

Because the disease can spread rapidly from one bird to another and then one location to another, the four outbreak locations have been placed under quarantine. Investigators are attempting to locate birds recently purchased from the affected premises.

In all four cases, the birds were purchased initially from an exotic bird dealer in Houston, Texas. State and federal investigators have quarantined the business locations of the Texas dealer until all birds there are tested. Investigators also are tracing birds purchased from the Texas dealer in recent weeks.

Two earlier outbreaks this year occurred in California and Nevada. Those birds were located, quarantined and evaluated so that no further infections occurred. The four cases in Indiana, Illinois and Michigan bring the number reported this year to six.

Exotic birds may enter the United States legally from many countries if accompanied by appropriate permits. The birds are required to be held for a minimum 30-day quarantine at one of six APHIS-operated facilities or a privately owned, APHIS-supervised, facility. APHIS tests the birds

during quarantine to make certain they are free of communicable poultry diseases before they are released.

“Nearly every year we are called on to investigate and contain outbreaks involving pet birds that have entered this country illegally,” Glosser said. “Fortunately, none of these outbreaks have invaded poultry farms since a 1971 outbreak spread to California poultry farms. It caused the death or destruction of more than 12 million birds (mostly laying hens) before it was eradicated in 1974 at a cost of \$56 million.”

Nationwide, the poultry industry employs 150,000 people and generates over \$26 billion in retail sales a year. In Indiana and Illinois, the industry employs 5,000 people and generates annual retail sales of \$600 million.

Buyers should make certain the birds they purchase are wearing a circular stainless steel USDA-approved leg band. The band is engraved with three letters and three numbers, and indicates the bird has met federal import requirements for quarantine and testing.

Travelers, pet dealers and hobbyists can obtain a free pamphlet and fact sheet on the strict rules governing bird imports and how to avoid the purchase of smuggled birds. Write to “Pet Bird Pamphlet,” USDA-APHIS, Room 613, Federal Building, 6505 Belcrest Road, Hyattsville, Md. 20782.

Margaret Webb (301) 436-6573

#

## **USDA RELEASES COST OF FOOD AT HOME FOR APRIL**

WASHINGTON, May 30—Here is the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s monthly update of the weekly cost of food at home for April 1991:

*Chart on next page.*

Cost of food at home for a week in April 1991

	-----Food plans----- (In Dollars)			
	Thrifty	Low-cost	Moderate cost	Liberal
Families:				
Family of 2 (20-50 years)	49.60	62.50	77.00	95.70
Family of 2 (51 years and over)	47.00	60.30	74.10	88.70
Family of 4 with preschool children	72.10	90.00	109.80	134.90
Family of 4 with elemen- tary schoolchildren	82.60	105.50	131.90	159.00
Individuals in four-person families:				
Children:				
1-2 years	13.00	15.90	18.50	22.40
3-5 years	14.00	17.30	21.30	25.50
6-8 years	17.10	22.80	28.60	33.30
9-11 years	20.40	25.90	33.30	38.70
Females:				
12-19 years	21.30	25.40	30.80	37.30
20-50 years	21.50	26.60	32.30	41.40
51 and over	21.30	26.00	32.00	38.20
Males:				
12-14 years	21.10	29.40	36.60	43.00
15-19 years	21.90	30.30	37.70	43.70
20-50 years	23.60	30.20	37.70	45.60
51 and over	21.40	28.80	35.40	42.40

USDA’s Human Nutrition Information Service computes the cost of food at home for four food plans—thrifty, low-cost, moderate-cost, and liberal.

Sue Ann Ritchko, HNIS administrator, said the plans consist of foods that provide well-balanced meals and snacks for a week.

In computing the costs, USDA assumes all food is bought at the store and prepared at home. Costs do not include alcoholic beverages, pet food, soap, cigarettes, paper goods and other nonfood items bought at the store.

“USDA costs are only guides to spending,” Ritchko said. “Families may spend more or less, depending on such factors as where they buy their food, how carefully they plan and buy, whether some food is produced at home, what foods the family likes, and how much food is prepared at home.”

“Most families will find the moderate-cost or low-cost plan suitable,” she said. “The thrifty plan, which USDA uses to set the coupon allotment in the food stamp program, is for families who have tighter budgets. Families with unlimited resources might use the liberal plan.”

To use the chart to estimate your family's food costs:

—For members eating all meals at home—or carried from home—use the amounts shown in the chart.

—For members eating some meals out, deduct 5 percent for each meal eaten away from home from the amount shown for the appropriate family member. Thus, for a person eating lunch out 5 days a week, subtract 25 percent, or one-fourth the cost shown.

—For guests, add 5 percent of the amount shown for the proper age group for each meal.

Costs in the second part of the chart pertain to individuals in fourperson families. If your family has more or less than four, total the “individual” figures and make these adjustments (note: larger families tend to buy and use food more economically than smaller ones):

—For a one-person family, add 20 percent.

—For a two-person family, add 10 percent.

—For a three-person family, add 5 percent.

—For a five- or six-person family, subtract 5 percent.

—For a family of seven or more, subtract 10 percent.

Details of the four family food plans are available from the Nutrition Education Division, HNIS, USDA, Federal Building, Hyattsville, Md. 20782.

Johna Pierce (301) 436-8617

#

## CARVER PAPERS TO BE USED IN PRESERVATION EXPERIMENTS AT USDA

WASHINGTON—George Washington Carver is once again in the vanguard for agricultural science.

The famed scientist, who spent a lifetime of discovery in agriculture, would no doubt be pleased that a collection of his papers has been selected by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Agricultural Library for an experiment in electronic information distribution.

NAL will use a microfilm collection of Carver's written materials from Tuskegee University to test the feasibility of converting microfilm to electronic page images that can be accessed by microcomputer.

NAL is optically scanning Carver's papers, converting them to electronic images and then making them available on high-capacity, laser-readable discs known as CD-ROM's. In this format, the material can be used by agricultural and research libraries worldwide. The libraries will then evaluate the effectiveness of the system for making scientific information more accessible.

The effort is part of NAL's National Agricultural Text Digitizing Project (NATDP), an ongoing investigation into using optical scanning techniques to preserve and disseminate the nation's priceless agricultural knowledge.

According to project coordinator Judi Zidar, the material chosen for this phase of the experiment must be informative, visually interesting and form a cohesive subject collection which is valuable in its own right.

"The Tuskegee University microfilm collection of the papers and letters of George Washington Carver more than fulfilled these criteria," Zidar said. "He is a major historical figure in agriculture who devoted himself to practical, hands-on agricultural research and education. The Tuskegee collection captures much of Carver's personality."

Tuskegee University has recorded Carver's papers, letters, records and drawings of seeds, plants and inventions on 67 reels of microfilm. With Tuskegee's permission, NAL is placing the contents of three of these microfilm reels on a CD-ROM, along with bibliographic information for accessing the material. The CD-ROM will also include the complete Guide to the Microfilm Edition of the George Washington Carver Papers at Tuskegee Institute.

The Carver CD-ROM is expected to be available for use and evaluation in December.

Brian Norris (301) 344-3778

Issued: May 31, 1991

#

## USDA ANNOUNCES FEES FOR CLASSING 1991 COTTON CROP

WASHINGTON, May 31—The U.S. Department of Agriculture announced today that fees charged cotton producers for manual and High Volume Instrument (HVI) classification of cotton will remain the same as in 1990, and that fees for standards and testing services will be raised.

Daniel D. Haley, administrator of USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service, said the anticipated increase in volume of cotton to be classed this coming year is expected to offset projected increases in costs that would normally cause the classing fee to be raised.

Fees to remain unchanged are \$1.23 per bale for manual classing and \$1.73 per bale for HVI classing.

Also to remain unchanged is the five-cents-per-bale discount offered to producer-agents who voluntarily provide centralized billing and collection services, Haley said.

Classing fees are set by a formula stipulated in the Uniform Cotton Classing Fees Act of 1987. Elements of the formula are estimated crop size, the rate of inflation and the operating reserve fund of AMS's Cotton Division, Haley said.

USDA will increase certain other fees for services such as fiber and processing testing and costs of practical forms of cotton standards. These increases are necessary because of higher costs for rent, utilities and mandated salary increases. The Uniform Cotton Classing Act of 1987 does not cover these services, and the fees imposed must reflect the full cost to AMS of providing the service.

The fee schedule will be published as a final rule in the May 31 Federal Register. Copies are available from Ronald H. Read, Cotton Division, AMS, USDA, rm. 2641-S, P.O. Box 96456, Washington, D.C. 20090-6456, telephone (202) 447-2145.

Clarence Steinberg (202) 447-6179

#

## **USDA ANNOUNCES 1992 WHEAT PROGRAM PROVISIONS**

WASHINGTON, May 31—Secretary of Agriculture Edward Madigan today announced a required 5 percent acreage reduction program for the 1992 wheat crop.

This level was chosen from the statutory range of 0 to 15 percent “to maintain U.S. competitiveness in world markets while balancing the risks of excessive supplies or possible shortages,” Madigan said.

Madigan also announced other provisions for the 1992 wheat program:

—The established target price is \$4.00 per bushel, the statutory minimum, no change from 1991.

—A paid land diversion will not be implemented.

—Other provisions of the wheat price support program will be announced at a later date.

Robert Feist (202) 447-6789

#

## **CCC INTEREST RATE FOR JUNE LOWERED TO 6-1/8 PERCENT**

WASHINGTON, June 3—Commodity loans disbursed in June by the U. S. Department of Agriculture’s Commodity Credit Corporation will carry a 6-1/8 percent interest rate, according to Keith Bjerke, executive vice president of the CCC.

The 6-1/8 percent interest rate is down from May’s 6-1/4 percent and reflects the interest rate charged CCC by the U.S. Treasury in June.

Robert Feist (202) 447-6789

#

## **U.S. DONATES FEED GRAINS TO GUATEMALA**

WASHINGTON, June 4—The U.S. Department of Agriculture has donated 20,000 metric tons of U.S. corn to Guatemala, according to F. Paul Dickerson, general sales manager of USDA’s Foreign Agricultural Service.

The \$2.3-million donation will be sold by the Guatemalan government to the National Poultry Producers Association for the production of feed.

Proceeds from the sale of the feed will be used to provide food assistance to the needy and to fund developmental activities primarily in the agricultural sector. The activities include agricultural extension and outreach efforts to improve production and marketing systems, and build small-scale irrigation systems and farm-to-market access roads. The supply period is fiscal year 1991.

The donation was made under Section 416(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, which authorizes the donation of surplus commodities owned by USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation to needy people overseas. The program is carried out by the U.S. Agency for International Development, acting as the agent of CCC.

For more information, contact James F. Keefer, FAS, (202) 382-9263.

Sally Klusaritz (202) 447-3448

#

## U.S. DONATES COMMODITIES TO EGYPT

WASHINGTON, June 4—The U.S. Department of Agriculture has donated 5,785 metric tons of butter oil, 300,000 metric tons of corn, and 100,000 metric tons of sorghum to Egypt.

F. Paul Dickerson, general sales manager of USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service, said the feed grains will be sold by the Egyptian government to local feed millers and farmers for livestock and poultry feed, according to Dickerson. The proceeds will be used for projects to help poor farmers. The butter oil will be made available to individual consumers.

"This \$55 million donation is the first of its kind to Egypt," Dickerson said. "In addition to helping the people of Egypt, this donation may help develop a potential market for these U.S. commodities."

The donation was made under the Section 416(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, which authorizes the donation of surplus commodities owned by USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation to needy people overseas. The program is carried out by the U.S. Agency for International Development, acting as the agent of CCC.

For more information, contact James F. Keefer, FAS, at (202) 382-9263.

Sally Klusaritz (202) 447-3448

#

**STATES ESTIMATED TO RECEIVE \$312 MILLION IN NATIONAL FOREST PAYMENTS**

HELSINGOR, Denmark, June 4—Secretary of Agriculture Edward Madigan today announced that 43 states and Puerto Rico will share an estimated \$312 million as their portion of the 1991 National Forest System receipts.

Madigan said that 25 percent of the total 1991 receipts will be returned to states in which National Forest System lands are located. The receipts are collected from land-use fees and sale of resources on 191 million acres of national forests and grasslands. States are required by federal law to use their share of the receipts for public schools and roads.

“Providing advance estimates of the state payments helps local budget planners complete their work,” Madigan said. The final payments will be based on actual receipts collected and may vary from the estimates announced today.

Interim payments representing 75 percent of the estimated total state shares of national forest receipts will be made in September. The balance will be paid in December, when final figures on the revenue collected during fiscal year 1991 are available. The counties in some of the states also share in the national grassland and land utilization project receipts which are based on calendar year 1991 revenues and will be paid in March, 1992.

States received more than \$346 million as their share of 1990 national forest revenues and participating counties received over \$5 million in revenue from land use fees on national grasslands.

	Payments from National Forest Receipts	Payments from Land Utilization Fees on National Grasslands
ALABAMA	\$1,281,371.53	
ALASKA	10,658,340.39	
ARIZONA	3,952,414.62	
ARKANSAS	5,255,069.74	\$3,125.00
CALIFORNIA*	52,327,795.99	150.00
COLORADO	3,663,472.69	356,535.26
FLORIDA	1,600,000.00	79,250.01

GEORGIA	868,500.00	
IDAHO	11,293,463.19	1,361.00
ILLINOIS	57,533.83	
INDIANA	22,146.98	
KANSAS		510,117.50
KENTUCKY	461,312.69	12,500.00
LOUISIANA	1,957,905.01	
MAINE	34,409.84	
MARYLAND		2,894.83
MICHIGAN	1,997,043.50	96,275.01
MINNESOTA	2,165,389.53	
MISSISSIPPI	5,052,318.82	
MISSOURI	2,178,050.06	701.75
MONTANA	7,805,091.53	
NEBRASKA	41,628.75	11,411.85
NEVADA	331,616.93	
NEW HAMPSHIRE	503,753.52	
NEW MEXICO	1,334,408.52	19,061.51
NEW YORK	8,418.63	
NORTH CAROLINA	606,266.15	
NORTH DAKOTA	54.34	2,772,570.25
OHIO	102,693.21	235.31
OKLAHOMA	655,610.92	211,797.73
OREGON*	137,244,797.71	6,250.00
PENNSYLVANIA	3,299,682.84	2,750.01
SOUTH CAROLINA	949,167.37	
SOUTH DAKOTA	1,828,522.27	155,928.38
TENNESSEE	392,926.49	
TEXAS	2,014,354.56	83,026.13
UTAH	1,440,956.90	
VERMONT	156,523.53	
VIRGINIA	414,902.00	
WASHINGTON*	40,026,456.37	
WEST VIRGINIA	952,181.14	
WISCONSIN	755,304.21	
WYOMING	1,632,337.45	351,850.00
PUERTO RICO	16,325.01	
	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	\$307,340,518.76	\$4,677,791.53

\*Estimated payments to California, Oregon and Washington were computed under a provision of the Interior and Related Agencies 1991 Appropriations Act. Section 316 of that act provides for payments to states for fiscal year 1991 of not less than 90% of the three-year average payments for fiscal years 1988-90 for those national forests affected by decisions on the northern spotted owl. Estimated payments to these states would be lower if based solely on actual receipts.

Ann Matejko (202) 475-3787

#

## **USDA PROPOSES TO ADJUST ITS REQUIREMENTS FOR INSPECTING HORSES AT HORSE SHOWS**

WASHINGTON, June 5—The U.S. Department of Agriculture is proposing to adjust its requirements for inspecting horses at horse shows under the Horse Protection Act.

“The proposed changes respond to feedback we received from people actually working at horse shows, indicating that some of our requirements are potentially risky, impractical or unnecessarily costly,” said James W. Glosser, administrator of USDA’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

“If the changes are implemented, inspections will go more smoothly, and there will be no increased risk that sore horses will go undetected,” Glosser said.

The Horse Protection Act is designed to eliminate soring—the use of cruel methods, devices or irritants to cause pain in a horse’s legs to make a more pronounced gait in the show ring.

To implement the Act, show management conducts pre-show inspections using specially trained and certified individuals, known as Designated Qualified Persons (DQP’s). DQP’s examine first-place winners again after their performance. In addition, APHIS inspectors monitor the work of the DQP’s by examining selected horses any time while they are on the show grounds.

The proposed changes seek to alleviate the following concerns:

—DQP’s risk injury from horses that may kick when their rear legs are examined physically, as is currently required. The proposed change would leave physical exams of rear legs to the DQP’s discretion. The DQP would be required to do the exam if there is an indication that the

horse is sore—for example, if the horse exhibits unusual movement of the rear legs or has lesions on the legs.

—Horse shows and inspections are delayed by the requirement that DQP's must measure pads and weigh devices attached to each horse's legs before it performs. The proposed change would require weighing and measuring before the performance only if a visual inspection raises suspicions that the pads and devices do not comply with the regulations. The inspection of winning horses after their performance would continue to include weighing of action devices and measuring of pads.

—Trainers run into problems with the requirement that entries in one class at a horse show be examined while the previous class of horses performs. The same trainer may have horses entered in two successive classes, and he or she can't attend to the inspection of a horse while riding another horse in the previous class.

The proposed change would allow inspection during the three classes prior to a horse's performance in large shows and during the previous two classes in small shows with fewer than 150 horses. A horse would have to stay within view of inspectors between the time it is inspected and the time it performs.

—Horses waiting to be shown need more than one attendant, generally a trainer and a groom; but current regulations don't permit both to be present in the holding area. The proposed change would allow both these attendants to be present. The rider, the DQP and the APHIS inspector would still be permitted in the holding area as well.

—Horse show managers run into significant expenses if they must hire more than one DQP for a relatively small show. Present regulations require a second DQP when more than 100 horses are entered. The proposed change would require a second DQP only if more than 150 horses are entered.

Notice of the proposal is being published in the June 6 Federal Register. Comments will be accepted if they are received on or before July 8. An original and three copies of written comments referring to docket 91-025 should be sent to Chief, Regulatory Analysis and Development; PPD-APHIS-USDA; Room 804 Federal Building; 6505 Belcrest Road; Hyattsville, Md. 20782.

Comments may be inspected as soon as received at USDA, Rm. 1141-S, 14th Street and Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C., between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays.

Sibyl Bowie (301) 436-5931

#

## **USDA RESEARCHER FOLLOWS IN THE BLACK BEAR'S FOOTSTEPS—LITERALLY**

WASHINGTON—‘We’re trying to change the image that people have of black bears, which is usually that of a snarling, lunging killer—as often portrayed on the cover of some magazines.’

That’s how Lynn Rogers, a wildlife research biologist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, described one of the goals of a continuing wildlife habitat study he is heading. The USDA study is also designed to develop ways in which timber used in forest products can be removed from the forest while, at the same time, maintaining the black bear’s habitat.

Rogers is stationed at the North Central Forest Experiment Station, run by USDA’s Forest Service near Ely, Minn. He has been conducting his study on-site. Literally. In fact, his technique is to actually live with the bears for 24 to 48 hours at a time, once a week.

That means he and his team of wildlife researchers follow the bears on foot through the Superior National Forest in northern Minnesota, staying only about five to 10 feet behind them at all times.

“We watch every move they make and every bite of food they take, and record that information in a hand-held computer,” he said. “And when they sleep, we sleep too, about 10 feet away.”

Rogers is six feet tall and weighs 200 lbs. The average adult black bear is about five to seven feet tall and weighs 150 to 600 lbs.

Rogers has been studying black bears for more than 24 years. He used to practice the more conventional method of sedating them with a tranquilizer mounted on the end of a stick, attaching radio collars to their necks, and then tracking them from above in a small airplane.

“This provided helpful information on how the black bears travel and forage,” he said. “But I felt we needed more detailed information on how bears survive in their surroundings and what their habits are.”

“That kind of information is hard to obtain from 1,000 feet up.”

Consequently, Rogers shifted his study technique to the more on-site, close-range activities he practices today. He has dubbed his technique the “Jane Goodall/Dian Fossey” approach, a reference to two scientists who conducted separate studies of African chimpanzees and gorillas, respectively, by living among their four-legged study subjects.

According to Rogers, his study is the only on-site, close-range effort being conducted anywhere on bears.

He has recently begun his sixth season of following the black bears on-site, since the bears started to emerge from winter hibernation in mid-April and were virtually all out and about, beginning to roam in search of food, by early May.

In the meantime, he has drawn a number of conclusions based on his first five years of on-site research.

“First, we’ve learned a lot about the body language of bears,” he said. “For instance, nearly all black bear lunges—in which a bear sharply exhales and then makes a short lunge toward the creature it wants to intimidate—are merely bluffs.”

“In fact,” he added, “if the creature shows any aggression, the bear will almost always run in the opposite direction.”

Rogers said that this is the type of information that can help dispel the fear humans have of black bears, and replace it with tolerance and accommodation. “This new awareness has already proved helpful in campground settings in the woods,” he said.

A second conclusion is that he has a much better understanding about how a bear uses the forest to survive. “For instance,” he said, “we have a better understanding of which forest habitats provide food and security to black bears during different seasons of the year.”

“In addition, we’ve watched how the bears turn to different parts of the forest, to provide such items as aquatic vegetation, in years when frost or drought reduce their usual sources of food, like berries and insects.”

A related issue is the fact that, according to black bear blood tests, the bears have high cholesterol counts—but don’t exhibit the physical problems, like heart trouble or clogged arteries, that normally accompany that condition. “We want to see why this is—and determine if the reasons have any human application,” he said.

His third conclusion addresses the obvious question of how the bears react to being followed so closely by humans. Rogers said that,

generally, the black bears ultimately decide that the person doing the following simply poses no threat or competition for food.

“At that point, the bears ignore us,” he said. “But it usually takes about 100 hours of quiet, unobtrusive following on our part, before that happens.”

Rogers’ fourth conclusion involves testing for practical problems for dealing with bears. Examples include development of a harmless bear repellant spray for use by campers and hikers and a bear-proof garbage dumpster for use at campgrounds and resorts.

A fifth conclusion concerns what Rogers described as the increasing problem of “forest fragmentation.” This is what happens when plots of forests are broken up into smaller individualized segments because of such factors as encroaching civilization, the rise in the number of vacation or retirement homes built on the edge of forests, and the establishment of farms where forests used to grow.

“The first animals to be affected by forest fragmentation are the ‘wide-ranging’ animals such as bears, wolves, and mountain lions,” he said. “Without the benefit of the forest buffers, the wide-ranging animals can’t reproduce fast enough in sufficient numbers to counter-balance their losses from human-caused deaths.”

One possible solution to this problem, he said, would be to leave forested “corridors” between the segments of forests so that the animals could continue their wide-ranging travel patterns.

According to Mike Lennartz, national coordinator of wildlife range and fish habitat research for the Forest Service, the black bear numbers about 8,000 in Minnesota and about 400,000 in North America. It is not listed as either an endangered species or a threatened species. Accordingly, hunters are allowed to obtain permits to kill black bears during bear-hunting season, from September to October.

Rogers said he doesn’t have a problem with regulated hunting of black bears—as long as it is regulated by officials sensitive to the needs and habitat of black bears. “By contrast,” he said, “I do have a problem with bear poachers and excessive killing of ‘nuisance’ bears.”

Rogers concluded that the results of his ongoing study continue to show that it’s important to learn—and practice—co-existence between bears and humans.

“Human attitudes will dictate whether the black bear will survive in the future, as human encroachment continues,” he said.

Lynn Rogers (218) 365-4138

Issued: June 5, 1991

#